ARTHUR S. BEEMAN (SBN 237996) asbeeman@jonesday.com 2017 PM b: 1 G. HOPKINS GUY, III (SBN 124811) hopguy@orrick.com PAMELA K. FULMER (SBN 154736) 2 KAI TSENG (SBN 193756) pkfulmer@jonesday.com ktseng@orrick.com JONES DAY 3 U.S. r MICHAEL C. SPILLNER 555 California Street, 26th Floor 1 COURT (SBN 205785) San Francisco, California 94104 4 mspillner@orrick.com Telephone: (415) 626-3939 Facsimile: (415) 875-5700 5 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP THOMAS R. JACKSON 6 1000 Marsh Road (to be admitted *pro hac vice*) Menlo Park, California 94025 7 triackson@jonesday.com (650) 614-7400 Telephone: DANIEL T. CONRAD Facsimile: (650) 614-7401 8 (to be admitted pro hac vice) dtconrad@jonesday.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs 9 JONES DAY ACER AMERICA CORP. and 2727 North Harwood Street GATEWAY, INC. 10 Dallas, Texas 75201-1515 Telephone: (214) 220-3939 Facsimile: (214) 969-5100 11 MARK C. SCARSI (SBN 183926) Attorneys for Plaintiff 12 mscarsi@milbank.com DELL INC. MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & 13 McCLOY LLP 601 South Figueroa Street, 30th Floor 14 Los Angeles, California 90017-5735 Telephone: (213) 892-4000 15 Facsimile: (213) 629-5063 16 Attorneys for Plaintiff 17 APPLE INC. 18 19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 20 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA C08 05624 21 ACER AMERICA CORP., APPLE INC., 22 DELL INC., and GATEWAY, INC., 23 Plaintiffs, COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT 24 ٧. **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 25 WI-LAN, INC.,

26

27

28

Defendant.

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

Plaintiffs Acer America Corp. ("Acer America"), Apple Inc. ("Apple"), Dell Inc. ("Dell"), and Gateway, Inc. ("Gateway") (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), for their Complaint against Wi-LAN, Inc. ("Wi-LAN"), hereby allege as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action for a declaratory judgment of non-infringement, invalidity, and unenforceability of United States Patent No. 6,549,759 (the "'759 patent") pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02, and the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 100 et seq., and for such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

2. This action includes patent-based declaratory judgment claims arising in connection with conduct occurring in or directed to Santa Clara County. This action is related to another action pending in the San Jose Division, *Intel Corporation v. Wi-LAN, Inc.*, Case No. 5:08-cv-04555-JW.

PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiff Acer America is an entity organized and existing under the laws of California, with its principal place of business at 333 West San Carlos Street, Suite 1500, San Jose, California 95110.
- 4. Plaintiff Apple is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of California, with its principal place of business at 1 Infinite Loop, Cupertino, California 95014.
- 5. Plaintiff Dell is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware and having its principal place of business at One Dell Way, Round Rock, Texas 78682.
- 6. Plaintiff Gateway is an entity organized and existing under the laws of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 7565 Irvine Center Drive, Irvine, California 92618.
- 7. On information and belief, defendant Wi-LAN, Inc., is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Canada and having its principal place of business at 11 Holland Avenue, Suite 608, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- 8. As alleged herein, Wi-LAN has engaged in various acts in and directed to California.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 9. The Court has exclusive subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a), 1367, 2201, and 2202, and the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1, et seq. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400.
- 10. Wi-LAN purports to be the owner of all rights, title, and interest in and to the '759 patent. Wi-LAN has made statements and representations threatening to assert the '759 patent against the Plaintiffs' products. Furthermore, Wi-LAN has confirmed its ability and willingness to file suit. The Plaintiffs have not infringed and do not infringe, either directly or indirectly, any valid and enforceable claim of the '759 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, nor are they aware of any infringement of the '759 patent. A substantial controversy exists between the parties which is of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant declaratory relief.
- 11. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Wi-LAN. Wi-LAN has conducted business in and directed to California, including pertaining to the '759 patent, and has engaged in various acts in and directed to California. Additionally, inventors and former assignees of the '759 patent, and attorneys responsible for the prosecution of the '759 patent, are believed to be located in California. Wi-LAN is in the business of asserting patent infringement claims and suing companies for patent infringement. In connection with that business, Wi-LAN has targeted and met with companies in Santa Clara County.

THE PATENT

12. The '759 patent is entitled "Asymmetric Adaptive Modulation in a Wireless Communication System," and bears an issuance date of April 15, 2003. A copy of the '759 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

COUNT I

(Declaration Of Noninfringement Of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,759)

13. The Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the allegations in paragraphs 1-12 as though fully set forth herein.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- The Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the allegations in paragraphs 1-20 as though
- On information and belief, individuals subject to the duty of candor under 37 C.F.R § 1.56 ("Applicants") engaged in inequitable conduct by withholding or misstating material information with intent to deceive the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") in connection with prosecuting the '759 patent, rendering the '759 patent unenforceable.

28

6

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25 26

27

28

- 23. On information and belief, during prosecution of the '759 patent, Applicants were aware of prior art that they knew was material to patentability, including prior public disclosures material to patentability that they deliberately failed properly to disclose to the USPTO with intent to deceive.
- 24. For example, on or around July 7, 2000, a document entitled "Media Access Control Layer Proposal for the 802.16.1 Air Interface Specification," was submitted to the 802.16 MAC Subgroup by Glen Sater, of Motorola, and Kenneth L. Stanwood, of Ensemble Corporation. Kenneth L. Stanwood is a named inventor on the '759 patent.
- 25. Applicants' public disclosures, including those described above, were material to the patentability of the application that issued as the '759 patent. On information and belief, during prosecution of the application that issued as the '759 patent, with intent to deceive the USPTO, Applicants failed to disclose these public disclosures to the USPTO. Under Wi-LAN's improper and incorrect apparent interpretations of the '759 patent's claims, these disclosures constitute prior art that render the claims of the '759 patent invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and/or 103.
- 26. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.
- 27. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that the Plaintiffs may ascertain their rights regarding the '759 patent.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiffs respectfully request that judgment be entered in their favor and pray that the Court grant the following relief:

- A. A declaration that each of the Plaintiffs has not infringed, either directly or indirectly, any valid and enforceable claim of the '759 patent;
 - B. A declaration that the claims of the '759 patent are invalid;
 - C. A declaration that the '759 patent is unenforceable;
 - An order declaring that each of the Plaintiffs is a prevailing party and that this is D.

an exceptional case, awarding each of the Plaintiffs its costs, expenses, disbursements, and 1 reasonable attorney fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and all other applicable statutes, rules and 2 common law; and 3 E. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper. 4 JURY DEMAND 5 The Plaintiffs hereby respectfully demand a trial by jury on all issues and claims so 6 triable. 7 8 Dated: December 17, 2008 Respectfully submitted, 9 un dunt C. Sp Kle 10 G. Hopkins Guy, III 11 Kai Tseng Michael C. Spillner 12 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP 13 1000 Marsh Road Menlo Park, CA 94025 14 Telephone: (650) 614-7400 Facsimile: (650) 614-7401 15 16 Attorneys for Plaintiffs ACER AMERICA CORP. and GATEWAY, INC. 17 18 19 Dated: December 17, 2008 Respectfully submitted, 20 21 Mark C. Scarsi MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & McCLOY LLP 22 601 South Figueroa Street, 30th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017-5735 23 Telephone: (213) 892-4000 24 Facsimile: (213) 629-5063 25 Attorneys for Plaintiffs APPLE INC. 26 27 28

1	an exceptional case, awarding each of the Plaintiffs its costs, expenses, disbursements, and		
2	reasonable attorney fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and all other applicable statutes, rules and		
3	common law; and		
4	E. Such other and furt	ther relief as this Court may deem just and proper.	
5		JURY DEMAND	
6	The Plaintiffs hereby respo	ectfully demand a trial by jury on all issues and claims so	
7	triable.		
8	D . 1 D . 14 A000		
9	Dated: December 17, 2008	Respectfully submitted,	
10			
11		G. Hopkins Guy, III Kai Tseng	
12		Michael C. Spillner	
13		ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP 1000 Marsh Road	
14		Menlo Park, CA 94025 Telephone: (650) 614-7400	
15		Facsimile: (650) 614-7401	
16		Attorneys for Plaintiffs ACER AMERICA CORP. and GATEWAY, INC.	
17	•	ACLANIZACA CORF. Ziju GATEWAT, INC.	
18			
19	Dated: December 17, 2008	Respectfully subpatted,	
20		Mark 1. Xmi	
21		Mark C. Scarsi MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & McCLOY LLP	
22		601 South Figueroa Street, 30th Floor	
23		Los Angeles, CA 90017-5735 Telephone: (213) 892-4000	
24		Facsimile: (213) 629-5063	
25 26		Attorneys for Plaintiffs APPLE INC.	
20 27			
28			
20		4	

1	Dated: December 17, 2008	Respectfully submitted,
2		arthur S. Beenan/34
3		Arthur S. Beeman
4		Pamela K. Fulmer JONES DAY
5		San Francisco Office 555 California Street, 26th Floor
6		San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 626-3939
7		Facsimile: (415) 875-3700
8		Thomas R. Jackson (to be admitted pro hac vice) Daniel T. Conrad (to be admitted pro hac vice)
9		JONES DAY 2727 North Harwood Street
10		Dallas, TX 75201-1515 Telephone: (214) 220-3939
11		Facsimile: (214) 969-5100
12		Attorneys for Plaintiff DELL INC.
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	ii	~